

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/699,517	10/31/2003		Dale B. Schenk	015270-008920US	8113	
20350	7590	05/15/2006		EXAMINER		
		TOWNSEND AND ROCENTER	STANDLEY	STANDLEY, STEVEN H		
EIGHTH FL		NO CENTER	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
SAN FRAN	CISCO, C	CA 94111-3834	1649			

DATE MAILED: 05/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No. Applicant(s)						
		10/699,517	SCHENK ET AL.	SCHENK ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Steven H. Standley	1649					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence ad	ldress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
1) 🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 M</u> .	arch 2006.						
·	·	action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowar	ice except for formal ma	atters, prosecution as to the	e merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-46,48,51-76 and 79-84</u> is/are pendi	ng in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-40 and 56-70</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)□	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	☑ Claim(s) 41-46,48,50-55,71-76 and 78-84 is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers							
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).								
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:			•,				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).								
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
AMaabaa -	4/0)							
Attachmen	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🗌 Intervie	w Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)								
. —	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5)	of Informal Patent Application (PT	O-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Uther:								

Application/Control Number: 10/699,517

Art Unit: 1649

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed 3/03/06 has been made of record. The text of those

sections of Title 35, U.S. Code, not included in this action can be found in a prior office

action.

Objections/Rejections: Withdrawn

Claim Objections

Objection to claim 78 is withdrawn due to applicant's cancellation of the claim.

ODP

Rejection of claims 41-42, 45, 47-48, 71-72, 75, 77, and 78 as obvious

double-patenting is withdrawn due to applicant's cancellation of claims 47, 77 and 78,

amendment to a method of treating a patient suffering from Parkinson's disease now

recited in the independent claim 41.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Rejection of claims 44-46, 48, 53-55, 71-76, and 78-80 under 35 USC § 112, 1^s

paragraph, enablement related specifically to claims encompassing numerous diseases

is withdrawn due to applicant's amendment to Parkinson's disease.

Objections/Rejections: Maintained/New Grounds

Page 2

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Rejection of claims 41-46, 48, and 50-55 under 35 USC § 112, 1st paragraph, enablement is maintained for the reasons made of record in the office action dated 10/07/05. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and not found to be persuasive. Applicant argues that "the possibility that the methods may not achieve a total cure or prevention is not detrimental to enablement and need not be excluded from the claims. Enablement does not require that the generic claims function in every conceivable circumstance."

On the contrary, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive because applicant's invention does not teach even one circumstance claimed. There are no examples of curing or preventing and no apparent circumstances wherein any animal is cured or the entire pathology of the disease is prevented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Rejection of claims 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51-55, 71, 72 74, 75 and 76, and 80-84 under 35 USC § 102(e) over Jensen is maintained for the reasons made of record in the office action dated 10/07/05. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and not found to be persuasive. Applicant makes the unsupported assertion that Jensen does not teach administration of A-beta for the treatment of Parkinson's. Further, applicant attempts to characterize the Jensen's intentions without any supporting language from Jensen et al, stating "insofar as on can determine what Jensen is proposing, it would appear more likely he is proposing that other diseases be treated not with A beta, *the*

Art Unit: 1649

major peptide associated with Alzheimer's disease, but with whatever peptide plays a comparable role in the disease in question [page 15, Remarks, emphasis added]." The logic of the previous statement is that one of skill in the art would not administer abeta to a Parkinson's patient because a-beta is not an amyloidogenic protein in Parkinson's disease. The examiner notes that nowhere in the Jensen patent application is applicant's interpretation supported. Furthermore, one of skill in the art at the time of Jensen knows that a-beta deposits are present in the brains of patient's with Parkinson's disease as well as Alzheimer's disease (see evidence below). Thus, one of skill in the art would have clearly understood the value of the combination of treating Parkinson's by administration of a-beta as claimed by Jensen because Jensen treats a patient population with amylodogenic disease that comprises plaques containing a-beta which is reasonably Parkinson's disease as well as Alzheimer's.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Rejection of claims 41, 43-46, 48, 50-55, 71, 73-76, 78-80 and 80-84 under 35 USC § 103(a) is maintained for the reasons made of record in the office action dated 10/07/06. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and not found to be persuasive. Applicant argues as above and further requests reconsideration of claims 54, 55, and 81-84. Jensen recites prevention throughout, and notably in 'field of invention' wherein prevention is of AD is disclosed. The only rationale way to prevent AD is to administer to a patient that currently does not have the disease. Therefor Jensen clearly contemplates the limitations of said claims.

Art Unit: 1649

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Primavera et al (1999) is a Harvard study of the distribution of

amyloid a-beta in neurodegenerative diseases other than Alzheimer's disease. Figure 4

(page 188) clearly shows that a-beta plaques are present in Parkinson's patients (see

'PD' at bottom and compare to control levels). Clearly a-beta containing amyloid

deposits are greater in abundance in PD than in age-matched control patients.

No claim is allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/699,517

Art Unit: 1649

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven H. Standley whose telephone number is (571) 272-3432. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Janet Andre can be reached on (571) 272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Steven Standley, Ph.D.

7/21/05 S/10/06

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 6